

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHRISTOPHER ROBERT LUTE,

Plaintiff,

v.

E. SILVA, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:20-cv-01122-CDB (PC)

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS'
REQUEST FOR AN EXTENSION OF
TIME TO RESPOND TO PLAINTIFF'S
DISCOVERY REQUESTS**

(Doc. 78)

Plaintiff Christopher Robert Lute is proceeding pro se and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This action proceeds on Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment excessive force claims against Defendants E. Moreno, A. Randolph, E. Romero and O. Valladolid.

I. BACKGROUND

On August 5, 2025, the Court issued its Order Lifting Stay (Doc. 74), and its Discovery and Scheduling Order (Doc. 75).

On October 17, 2025, Defendants filed their request for an extension of time within which to respond to Plaintiff's discovery requests. (Doc. 78.) The Court finds a response by Plaintiff to be unnecessary.

II. DISCUSSION

Defendants indicate their responses to Plaintiff's discovery requests are due October 21, 2025. They seek a 14-day extension of time within which to respond to Plaintiff's interrogatories and request for production of documents, served September 3, 2025.¹ Defense counsel commenced obtaining responsive documents and information from the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation upon receipt from her office's docketing unit, however, she had not yet received all the requested information. Counsel states once she receives the remaining requested information, she will need additional time to review it, finish completing the draft responses, and to obtain verifications from the individual Defendants.

District courts have broad discretion to manage discovery and to control the course of litigation under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16. *Hunt v. County of Orange*, 672 F.3d 606, 616 (9th Cir. 2012). When an act must be done within a specified time, the court may, for good cause, extend the time with or without motion or notice if the court acts, or if a request is made, before the original time expires. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A).

Here, the Court finds good cause to extend the deadline for Defendants' responses to Plaintiff's written discovery requests.

III. CONCLUSION AND ORDER

Accordingly, the Court **HEREBY ORDERS:**

1. Defendants' request for an extension of time within which to respond to Plaintiff's written discovery requests (Doc. 78) is **GRANTED**; and
2. Defendants **SHALL** respond to Plaintiff's interrogatories and request for production of documents **no later than November 4, 2025**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **October 21, 2025**

Chris D. Brown
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

¹ The discovery requests bear a postmark of September 6, 2025.